

**From:** [Christine Chute](#)  
**To:** [CityRecorder](#)  
**Subject:** WRITTEN TESTIMONY on Salem Airport Proposal  
**Date:** Friday, January 6, 2023 3:59:09 PM

---

Dear City Council Members,

Please do not invest Salem's limited funds in the moribund Salem Airport. It seems very unlikely to me that an airline would have any better luck now than the last time we had Salem air service -- fine for a while, then good-bye.

Instead, spend the General Fund money on priorities that have already been identified for the city, rather than some scheme that seems doomed to failure from the start. The money would be better spent on projects designed to improve transportation from Salem to PDX (which already has an excellent, well-used, and modern airport). Or on projects designed to improve safety for pedestrians and bicyclists in Salem. Or a CAHOOTS-type unit for Salem.

If you go ahead with this scheme, I suggest that you impose a user fee on people who choose to use the Salem airport so that it at least comes close to paying for itself.

Christine

--

Christine Chute  
Ward 2  
Salem

**From:** [Jim Scheppke](#)  
**To:** [CityRecorder](#)  
**Subject:** 1/9/23 Testimony of 350 Salem OR on Agenda Items 5a and 5b (UPDATE)  
**Date:** Sunday, January 8, 2023 10:31:11 PM

---

Dear Mayor and City Council:

Please accept this update to the 350 Salem OR petition opposing commercial air service in Salem with these additional signatures:

77.	Sarah Acosta
78.	Michelle Achee
79.	James Aiken
80.	Robert Plata
81.	Justin Castillo
82.	Sean Nikas
83.	Wes Bouche
84.	Joe Tilman
85.	Kathleen Moynihan
86.	Alan Holland
87.	Ellen Stevens

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Jim Scheppke <[jscheppke@comcast.net](mailto:jscheppke@comcast.net)>  
**Subject:** 1/9/23 Testimony of 350 Salem OR on Agenda Items 5a and 5b  
**Date:** January 6, 2023 at 11:32:17 AM PST  
**To:** City Recorder <[cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net](mailto:cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net)>  
**Cc:** Salem City Council <[Citycouncil@cityofsalem.net](mailto:Citycouncil@cityofsalem.net)>

Dear Mayor and City Council:

On behalf of 350 Salem OR, I submit the following petition opposing commercial air service in Salem signed by 76 Salem residents:

## **Petition Opposing Costly and Polluting Commercial Air Service in Salem**

A group of well-heeled business interests is trying to convince the Salem City Council to spend millions of taxpayer dollars to subsidize the resumption of commercial air service in Salem.

This is not the first time Salem has tried this. United Airlines pulled out of Salem in 1980 after failing to sell enough tickets. The same thing happened with Delta Airlines in 2008 and again with a smaller airline in

2011. Salem is a three-time loser, so why can't we learn from that?

Commercial air service is not needed here. Salem is only 75-90 minutes away from the Portland International Airport. An airport shuttle service makes 17 departures a day at a reasonable cost.

Initially there would only be, at most, four flights a week from Salem to destinations in California and Nevada. But to accommodate this, the City would need to hire 9 FTE staff at a cost of \$1.3 million per year and make minimum improvements to the small Salem terminal costing nearly \$1.9 million.

The City estimates total annual cost of \$2.37 million in Year 1 for four to eight flights per week. By Year 6, even assuming 16 flights per week, the subsidy would still be \$721,000 per year. The cost would have to be borne by homeowners with their property taxes and by renters with increased rent costs.

Commercial air service in Salem does not pass an "equity lens" test. 32% of persons in US households with income under \$40,000 have never taken a commercial airline flight (that would be about 40% of Salem residents). 92% of persons in US households with incomes over \$80,000 (about 28% of people in Salem) are occasional or frequent flyers. It is not equitable for lower and middle income Salem residents who may never fly or seldom fly to have to subsidize occasional and frequent flyers.

Commercial air service in Salem does not pass a "climate lens" test. Airline travel is the most carbon emitting form of transportation by far. For example, two people traveling from Portland to San Francisco would be responsible for emitting 116 kg per person of carbon traveling by plane, 70 kg by car and 28 kg by train or bus. When most transportation by car or bus is electrified in the coming years the difference will be even greater.

The Salem City Council has set a goal of cutting our carbon emissions in half by 2035 and reaching "net zero" emissions by 2050. If they are serious about reaching these goals, and about not placing an inequitable burden on taxpayers and renters, they will reject the plan for commercial air service in Salem.

Comments	
1. Jim Scheppke	<i>Salem already has a structural deficit problem that this plan would only worsen. It is fiscally irresponsible.</i>
2. Tamra Hart	
3. Michael Hughes	
4. Teresa Joslin	<i>Airline travel is the most carbon-emitting form of</i>

*transportation. Commercial air service in Salem is a waste of tax payer money.*

- 
- |                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| 5. Jennifer Sprague   |  |
| 6. Lisa Novak         |  |
| 7. Diane Chavez       | <i>I would rather not have the noise and air pollution associated with planes flying over my neighborhood. The money would be better spent on better public transit to Portland as well as Southern Oregon and the entire west coast.</i>  |
| 8. Joseph Novak       |  |
| 9. Les Margosian      | <i>An unbelievably foolish project. As ably described in 350Salem article it was tried tree times in past and never worked. The idea is a splendid example of Babbitry as the main objective is to puff-up Salem's image as a burg important enough to be served by commercial airlines. Also, as pointed out by article, the estimated costs are absurd: I'd love to see our City staff do a cost benefit analysis with their own current budget figures. Finally, yet another example of how ridiculous staff's proposals/recommendations are, Council will enthusiastically endorse them!</i> |
| 10. Norman Baxter     | <i>A waste of money and environmentally destructive.</i>   |
| 11. Susann Kaltwasser |  |
| 12. Jo Ann Leadingham |  |
| 13. Philip Carver     |  |
| 14. Spencer Woolley   |  |
| 15. Sarah Deumling    |  |
| 16. Meg Hummon        |  |
| 17. Laurie Dougherty  |  |
| 18. Pedro Cabrera     |  |
| 19. Roberta Cade      |  |
| 20. Justin Perkins    |  |
| 21. Zachary Aldrich   |  |
| 22. Kim Davis         |  |
| 23. Michelle Achee    |  |
| 24. Shanon Nabors     |  |
| 25. Rachael Spada     |  |
| 26. Marissa Theve     | <i>We need to consider connecting our 3 largest cities with more reliable transit first. I would much rather go to PDX in an hourly bus than increase the environmental injustice to folks living near McNary Field. The City is failing to consider all reasonable alternatives.</i>  |
| 27. Erika Guzman      |  |
| 28. Benjamin Dochoda  |  |
-

29.	Thomas Kent	
30.	Christopher Simmons	
31.	Adam Dillon	
32.	Alex Korsunsky	<i>Why should public money subsidize rich people burning carbon? Use the money for train or bike or bus infrastructure instead.</i>
33.	Katherine Clark	
34.	Natalie Thamert	
35.	Vita Solis-Romano	
36.	Grant Boro	
37.	Claudia Burton	
38.	Brian Hines	<i>I'm tired of what Greta Thunberg calls the "blah, blah, blah" approach to fighting climate change: lots of talk, very little action. Salem needs to stop talking about reducing our greenhouse gas pollution and actually DO something about this.</i>
39.	Nicole Rodgers	
40.	Timothy Hulscher	
41.	Larry Sipe	
42.	Ricardo Rojas	
43.	Logan Johnson	<i>As a resident of a neighborhood close to the airport, the last thing I want is more, and bigger, flights overhead constantly. It pollutes both our environment and our noise, and the 6 million dollar bill will be footed by us to give private enterprise the profits. If you want to improve transit in Salem, and Oregon in general, then start putting money into something actually useful like our bus lines and our railways.</i>
44.	Kameron Monk	
45.	Elizabeth Henderson	
46.	Cheryl Hummon	
47.	Kayleen Warner	
48.	Christine Chute	
49.	Emily Standish	
50.	Mark Wigg	
51.	Michael Medlock	
52.	Walter Perry	
53.	Benigno Chavez	
54.	James Ciaramitaro	<i>Too few people will use it; while the whole community will be taxed for it.</i>
55.	Barbara Ray	
56.	Peter Bergel	
57.	Sandra Oliver-Poore	
58.	Claudia Howells	
59.	Melody Foster	
60.	Mary Ann Baclawski	

61. Cynthia Jones	
62. Jerry Turner	
63. Donald Davis	<i>There is not enough demand for an airport in salem. And one that only operates one day a week and with enormous subsidies is not going to be effective long term. The opportunity cost is too high.</i>
64. Clifford Eiffler-Rodriguez	
65. Mary Neuendorf	
66. Robert Gonzalez	
67. Mary Nikas	
68. Desta Moore	
69. John Macmillan	
70. Nadene LeCheminant	
71. Brett Aldrich	
72. Beth Sell	<i>I would like money and efforts to go towards social and justice related causes that will benefit more of the areas citizens.</i>
73. Frances Loberg	
74. Bonnie Heppner	
75. Laura Heppner	
76. Judy Rankin	<i>Airlines do not want to expand to areas that cannot support their air service. Salem does not have the population to sustain a regional airline.</i>

Jim Scheppke, Ward 2  
[jscheppke@comcast.net](mailto:jscheppke@comcast.net)  
503-269-1559

**From:** [Jim Scheppke](#)  
**To:** [CityRecorder](#)  
**Cc:** [citycouncil](#)  
**Subject:** 1/9/23 Testimony of 350 Salem OR on Agenda Items 5a and 5b  
**Date:** Friday, January 6, 2023 11:32:48 AM

---

Dear Mayor and City Council:

On behalf of 350 Salem OR, I submit the following petition opposing commercial air service in Salem signed by 76 Salem residents:

## **Petition Opposing Costly and Polluting Commercial Air Service in Salem**

A group of well-heeled business interests is trying to convince the Salem City Council to spend millions of taxpayer dollars to subsidize the resumption of commercial air service in Salem.

This is not the first time Salem has tried this. United Airlines pulled out of Salem in 1980 after failing to sell enough tickets. The same thing happened with Delta Airlines in 2008 and again with a smaller airline in 2011. Salem is a three-time loser, so why can't we learn from that?

Commercial air service is not needed here. Salem is only 75-90 minutes away from the Portland International Airport. An airport shuttle service makes 17 departures a day at a reasonable cost.

Initially there would only be, at most, four flights a week from Salem to destinations in California and Nevada. But to accommodate this, the City would need to hire 9 FTE staff at a cost of \$1.3 million per year and make minimum improvements to the small Salem terminal costing nearly \$1.9 million.

The City estimates total annual cost of \$2.37 million in Year 1 for four to eight flights per week. By Year 6, even assuming 16 flights per week, the subsidy would still be \$721,000 per year. The cost would have to be borne by homeowners with their property taxes and by renters with increased rent costs.

Commercial air service in Salem does not pass an "equity lens" test. 32% of persons in US households with income under \$40,000 have never taken a commercial airline flight (that would be about 40% of Salem residents). 92% of persons in US households with incomes over \$80,000 (about 28% of people in Salem) are occasional or frequent flyers. It is not equitable for lower and middle income Salem residents who may never fly or seldom fly to have to subsidize occasional and frequent flyers.

Commercial air service in Salem does not pass a "climate lens" test. Airline travel is the most carbon emitting form of transportation by far. For example, two people traveling from Portland to San Francisco would be responsible for emitting 116 kg per person of carbon traveling by plane, 70 kg by car and 28 kg by train or bus. When most transportation by car or bus is electrified in the coming years the difference will be even greater.

The Salem City Council has set a goal of cutting our carbon emissions in half by 2035 and reaching "net zero" emissions by 2050. If they are serious about reaching these goals, and about not placing an inequitable burden on taxpayers and renters, they will reject the plan for commercial air service in Salem.

Comments	
1. Jim Schepke	<i>Salem already has a structural deficit problem that this plan would only worsen. It is fiscally irresponsible.</i>
2. Tamra Hart	
3. Michael Hughes	
4. Teresa Joslin	<i>Airline travel is the most carbon-emitting form of transportation. Commercial air service in Salem is a waste of tax payer money.</i>
5. Jennifer Sprague	
6. Lisa Novak	
7. Diane Chavez	<i>I would rather not have the noise and air pollution associated with planes flying over my neighborhood. The money would be better spent on better public transit to Portland as well as Southern Oregon and the entire west coast.</i>
8. Joseph Novak	
9. Les Margosian	<i>An unbelievably foolish project. As ably described in 350Salem article it was tried tree times in past and never worked. The idea is a splendid example of Babbitry as the main objective is to puff-up Salem's image as a burg important enough to be served by commercial airlines. Also, as pointed out by article, the estimated costs are absurd: I'd love to see our City staff do a cost benefit analysis with their own current budget figures. Finally, yet another example of how ridiculous staff's proposals/recommendations are, Council will enthusiastically endorse them!</i>
10. Norman Baxter	<i>A waste of money and environmentally destructive.</i>
11. Susann Kaltwasser	
12. Jo Ann Leadingham	
13. Philip Carver	
14. Spencer Woolley	
15. Sarah Deumling	
16. Meg Hummon	
17. Laurie Dougherty	



18.	Pedro Cabrera	
19.	Roberta Cade	
20.	Justin Perkins	
21.	Zachary Aldrich	
22.	Kim Davis	
23.	Michelle Achee	
24.	Shanon Nabors	
25.	Rachael Spada	
26.	Marissa Theve	<i>We need to consider connecting our 3 largest cities with more reliable transit first. I would much rather go to PDX in an hourly bus than increase the environmental injustice to folks living near McNary Field. The City is failing to consider all reasonable alternatives.</i>
27.	Erika Guzman	
28.	Benjamin Dochoda	
29.	Thomas Kent	
30.	Christopher Simmons	
31.	Adam Dillon	
32.	Alex Korsunsky	<i>Why should public money subsidize rich people burning carbon? Use the money for train or bike or bus infrastructure instead.</i>
33.	Katherine Clark	
34.	Natalie Thamert	
35.	Vita Solis-Romano	
36.	Grant Boro	
37.	Claudia Burton	
38.	Brian Hines	<i>I'm tired of what Greta Thunberg calls the "blah, blah, blah" approach to fighting climate change: lots of talk, very little action. Salem needs to stop talking about reducing our greenhouse gas pollution and actually DO something about this.</i>
39.	Nicole Rodgers	
40.	Timothy Hulscher	
41.	Larry Sipe	
42.	Ricardo Rojas	
43.	Logan Johnson	<i>As a resident of a neighborhood close to the airport, the last thing I want is more, and bigger, flights overhead constantly. It pollutes both our environment and our noise, and the 6 million dollar bill will be footed by us to give private enterprise the profits. If you want to improve transit in Salem, and Oregon in general, then start putting money into something actually useful like our bus lines and our railways.</i>
44.	Kameron Monk	
45.	Elizabeth Henderson	
46.	Cheryl Hummon	

47.	Kayleen Warner	
48.	Christine Chute	
49.	Emily Standish	
50.	Mark Wigg	
51.	Michael Medlock	
52.	Walter Perry	
53.	Benigno Chavez	
54.	James Ciaramitaro	<i>Too few people will use it; while the whole community will be taxed for it.</i>
55.	Barbara Ray	
56.	Peter Bergel	
57.	Sandra Oliver-Poore	
58.	Claudia Howells	
59.	Melody Foster	
60.	Mary Ann Baclawski	
61.	Cynthia Jones	
62.	Jerry Turner	
63.	Donald Davis	<i>There is not enough demand for an airport in salem. And one that only operates one day a week and with enormous subsidies is not going to be effective long term. The opportunity cost is too high.</i>
64.	Clifford Eiffler-Rodriguez	
65.	Mary Neuendorf	
66.	Robert Gonzalez	
67.	Mary Nikas	
68.	Desta Moore	
69.	John Macmillan	
70.	Nadene LeCheminant	
71.	Brett Aldrich	
72.	Beth Sell	<i>I would like money and efforts to go towards social and justice related causes that will benefit more of the areas citizens.</i>
73.	Frances Loberg	
74.	Bonnie Heppner	
75.	Laura Heppner	
76.	Judy Rankin	<i>Airlines do not want to expand to areas that cannot support their air service. Salem does not have the population to sustain a regional airline.</i>



**From:** [Sean Nikas](#)  
**To:** [CityRecorder](#)  
**Subject:** Salem City Council 1/9/2023 Meeting Agenda Items 5a & B  
**Date:** Monday, January 9, 2023 11:07:36 AM

---

Hello,

Please vote no on the airport expansion.

The expansion has significant costs but does not raise significant revenues to cover those costs making it a burden on other city services. Given Salem's current budget constraints it is fiscally irresponsible to spend millions on an airport expansion at this time.

Only the wealthiest members of our community would use the airport. This makes the airport expansion a wealth transfer from lower and middle income households to wealthy households.

The airport expansion will make it very difficult for Salem to meet it's carbon goals.

The most likely outcome is the the new flights will fail and the as yet unidentified airline will abandon Salem again. We are Charlie Brown trying to kick the football.

Sean Nikas - Salem Resident

☐ Sent via [Cloze](#)